John Donne Journal
Vol. 12, Nos. 1 & 2 (1993)

"Poets be silent": Self-Silencing Conventions and Rhetorical Context in the 1633 Critical Elegies on Donne

A. E. B. Coldiron

The twelve elegies appended to Donne's 1633 *Poems* seem to perform many of the functions expected of funeral elegy: praise, lament, consolation; asking the essential questions of death; attempting to gain control over unimaginable absence.[1] However, these elegies contain not only qualified praise, defensive lament, and ironic, unconvincing consolation, but elegiac material handled such that concerns other than Donne and his death become paramount. These elegies belong, of course, to what A. J. Murphy[2] calls the sub-genre of "critical elegy," funeral elegy written about a dead poet and modified to focus on literary issues. Four issues special to critical elegy are of particular concern in the 1633 critical elegies; two of these will receive attention here. First, confusion over rhetorical context (notably over audience, subject, and occasion) indicates initial problems in the sub-genre. Second, these elegists respond to the occasion by deploying several of the sub-genre's conventions—the inadequacy topos, the self-memorializing poet, the inexpressibility topos—in an especially self-obviating manner.[3] This collection may lead us to reconsider our expectations of the sub-genre's contexts, purposes, and achievements.

The elegies in the 1633 *Poems* exhibit a surprising confusion over matters that one would expect to be quite clear in so venerable and codified a genre as funeral elegy and in so narrowly-delimited a sub-genre as critical elegy. Audience, occasion, subject (and even genre itself), all of which are usually fairly clear in funeral elegy, here show significant blurring.[4] The titles in this collection immediately display the elegists' anxiety and confusion regarding occasion. Although five titles openly proclaim the *death* of Donne as the occasion (see Appendix), two euphemize the death occasion ("To the memory of" and "In memory of"), and five titles omit death entirely and proclaim Donne himself the occasion. Wilson is clearer about occasion: "On Donne and his poems" better identifies what may be a "real," more literary occasion

beneath the ostensible, human occasion, Donne's death. Is the "real" occasion of these elegies the death of a major poet, the end of his poetry, or a chiefly literary occasion, the publication of 1633?

Sir Thomas Browne specifies his occasion as "Upon the Promiscuous printing of his Poems, the Looser sort, with the Religious." Browne, more than the others, seems to perceive his task as a moral justification only incidentally caused by the author's death—a justification whose real occasion and impetus are the printing and arrangement of this volume of poems.[5] We get the feeling from Browne that, had not John Marriot printed this volume, or at least had he not had the gall to mingle secular poems with the sacred, Browne might never have felt compelled to elegize. Is a controversial publication, then, an elegiac occasion? While the other elegists' titles indicate subliminal occasion-confusion, Browne's reveals it more fully. Beyond this confusion of occasion, Browne's title, which begins "To the deceased author," also indicates a certain confusion of audience.[6]

Browne is not alone in audience-confusion. Seven of the twelve elegies use apostrophe to extend themselves into an imaginative space wherein the deceased author is subliminally present or at least able to hear their elegies.[7] Such apostrophes to the deceased, though conventional devices, actually encourage a play of audience. They conjure to the moment of elegy-reading an almost prosopopoeic Donne. It is easy to argue that such a fiction attempts to defeat death/absence and restore the deceased's presence, the sort of Lacanian *fort-da* Peter Sacks discusses.[8] I would propose an additional, pragmatic, literary possibility. Conjuring Donne's presence is something like addressing thanks in a symphony program to the big benefactors: they almost never show up, but it lets the "real" audience (looking around for them in vain) know who's who, and whence cometh power or inspiration to make possible the performance. Conjuring Donne's presence/absence in this way simultaneously elevates him (who once suffered greatly for lack of patronage) to the status of Great Patron of Art but still removes him effectively from the poetic process.[9]

Obviously the "real" audience of such apostrophes is not Donne but readers of the elegies, mere witnesses who can thus feel the power behind the performance. An even more "real" audience would be the purchasers of this volume of poems, people who have probably never known Donne but who have necessarily engaged with his work in the preceding three hundred seventy-two pages. Even the Printer's Preface opens with a clear distinction between mere "readers" and "understanders," the latter being the audience he deliberately selects as worthy. The "real" audience's primary engagement,

then, is literary rather than personal, an engagement not with the assumed occasion or the supposed subject (death or loss), but rather with the "real" occasion, the printing of the poems, and the "real" subject, Donne's poetry.

Apostrophe in four of the elegies defines an even narrower audience than this "real" and necessary audience of Donne-poetry purchasers and readers. The elegies of Walton, Cary, Busby, and Porter address Donne's literary heirs directly. Walton addresses the entire age, but treats Donne's specific poetic accomplishments. His lines 26-53 read like a *DLB* in pentameter couplets addressed specifically to the current "Dull Age" (19). Porter, Busby, and Cary most clearly define their "real" audience, poets, by addressing poets directly and by exhorting them. "Poets attend" opens Cary's, and poets must be "chiefe mourners" (4). Busby specifies "Poets, I speake to" (83). According to Scaliger, elegy must end in exhortation,[10] and Porter complies, ending his poem with an exhortation to his most "real" audience, "Poets" (25). We will see below how the particular exhortations and the responses to Donne's greatness vary, but the apostrophes to poets further the powerful interest directed at an especially literary segment of the "real" audience.

If the "real" occasion is publication, the "real" audience readers and especially poets, and the "real" subject poetry, is the "real" genre elegy? Yes and no; critical elegy, like other sub-genres, transforms its parent-genre's conventions. But the confusion of audience, subject, and occasion in these elegies indicates that more is involved in critical elegy than usually thought. The sub-genre is not quite as simple as elegy-for-a-poet, and has unique problem points to explore. Like the sub-genre of "remembrance" N. A. Gutierrez establishes (elegy modified to serve social and political purposes),[11] this sub-genre has its own problems and issues beneath those of the wider elegy. Several of the main problem-points in critical elegy have already been mapped, but are worth brief discussion here as applied to this collection.

Sidney Gottlieb feels that the main difficulty these elegists faced was a problem of praise, and of "reconciling the details of [Donne's] early and later life."[12] Not only that, there is a dual genre-problem of reconciling both his early and late *life* (for funeral elegy) and his early and late *poetry* (for critical elegy). Elegiac praise of a figure like Donne was hard for a number of reasons—what do you do with such a frankly sexual poet, in a moralizing age, in a spiritualizing genre? Elegy, I think, mimics a traditional understanding of death in letting the fleshly rot while elevating the spiritual. To solve the problem of praising Donne's early life, the elegists include less praise of the flesh, of Donne himself, and more praise of the poetry. Here the spiritualizing demand of funeral elegy is in happy concord with the literary interests of

critical elegy. But what about Donne's sexy, secular poetry? Critical elegy finds it irresistible; funeral elegy wants to censure/censor it.[13] Fallon[14] and Gottlieb detail the elegists' struggles with the spirit-flesh problem; beyond their analyses, it is worth noting that the elegists essentially miniaturized the process of the volume itself, sneaking the secular stuff into the middle and weighting the more prominent outer parts with the sacred. This is consistent with the age's apparent appetite for Donne's sacred works, which, judging from *STC* entries, was much greater than that for his secular works.[15] Whoever assembled the volume and included the elegies saw value in the secular works that evidently had not been of primary interest to consumers. The elegists saw the same value and, despite any perceived risk, likewise inserted mention of the secular poetry in their elegies. But given the strategic positioning of sacred and secular in this volume, and even given any perceived difficulties with the secular Donne, the praise of Donne is not unqualified. Instead of the expected hyperbolic, elegiac fiction of universal approval, these elegists sound defensive. Defensiveness, unease, anxiety, are not the ususal epideictic tones, and Sidney Gottlieb even wonders if "perhaps the elegy as a form inevitably tends toward apology."[16]

Beyond, however, what Gottlieb, Fallon, Michael Parker,[17] and others have noted, the problems of praise work themselves out in genre-anxiety in these poems. First in evidence is a sense of genre-self-consciousness. Many of the twelve elegies follow accepted funeral-elegy practices.[18] But writing critical elegy is trickier than writing funeral elegy, and these poets display more difficulty carving out the sub-genre than has generally been discussed. Although the venerable form was fairly resistent to change, there is evidence of a good bit of genre-anxiety in these funeral-critical-elegies.

These poets want to make sure we know they are observing generic convention, even as they alter it. Despite the altered critical-elegiac rhetorical context of subject, audience, and occasion, the elegists seem to cling to the funeral-elegiac. Four poets specify "elegie" in the title.[19] As is conventional, epicede trails quietly along beside some of these elegies, in the frequent mention of hearses, processions, and mourners, recalling elegy's long association with burial ritual. And six poets specify within the poems self-consciously (and needlessly) that they are writing elegy or epitaph.[20] Several poets include epitaphs, either set off from the poem and named as such,[21] or mentioned as "inscription" or "urne."[22] An inscription or epitaph is of course a funeral-elegy convention, but is also a peculiarly literary act, and a lyric one: making words permanent, trying to capture the transient, conveying a verbal message about an emotional event.

Some genre-self-consciousness of this sort is not surprising, but in these poems self-consciousness often expands to full genre-anxiety. A few poets mention genre in seeming fear of straying out of the bounds of funeral elegy. Busby's "No more of this, least some should say, that I/ Am strai'd to Satyre, meaning Elegie" (63-4) stands almost as an apologia for the preceding 45 lines, in which he compares Donne's critics unfavorably to Donne with specific points of reference. Of course, praise-by-contrast is a conventional feature of funeral elegy,[23] but these back-pedalling lines recall Aristotle's division of the epideictic (noble) and the satiric (mean), and imply that the elegist feels his sub-genre slipping away from funeral-elegy convention toward a meaner sort of genre with which he wants no association. This kind of genre-anxiety, in which a poet recalls his generic intention, realizes he has strayed from it, and tries to return to it, indicates sub-purposes stirring beneath the smooth elegiac surface presented. He senses in critical elegy a danger of decorum slippage, a problem with critical-elegiac praise.

At the other end of the spectrum, Walton senses a problem with funeral-elegiac praise, a danger of being obsequious. Walton ends his poem by stating a major genre-tension openly and succinctly; "I/ Write no Encomium, but an Elegie" (82). Is Walton (whose hagiographic impulses Fallon notes[24]) signalling his rejection of pure praise, his rejection of one of the age's terms for flattery ("encomium"), or his reduction/alteration of the praise-component of funeral elegy in favor of something else? Consider also the latter part of the Printer's Preface:

> . . . That whereas it hath pleased some, who had studyed and did admire him, to offer to the memory of the Author, not long after his decease, I have thought I should do you service in presenting them unto you now; onely whereas, had I placed them in the beginning, they might have serv'd for so many Encomiums of the Author (as is usuall in other workes, where perhaps there is need of it, to prepare men to digest such stuffe as follows after,) you shall finde them in the end . . . .[25]

Even the printer feels the genre-anxiety that accompanies critical elegy, the need to justify his unusual placement of praise, the need to remind us that critical elegy is not encomium. While the printer explains the ordering of his volume and the inclusion of the elegies, he never uses the word "elegy."

Just as the problems of praise surface in the poets' genre-anxiety and in their attempts to detach critical elegy from funeral elegy, so the problems of

lament and consolation find a generic locus. The problem of lamenting loss in a poem is the more pressing when faced with an intensely literary occasion, subject, and audience, and an ambitious elegist may hope that his own poem will stand as consolation. For lament, critical elegists employ a standard inadequacy topos and do not need to modify it much; we will see, however, that the inexpressibility topos offers only ironic consolation in these critical elegies. Again, both transformed elegiac conventions must stretch in the move to sub-genre.

Among the collection's numerous inadequacy topoi[26] occur certain expressions of both a generalized and a specified sense of genre-inadequacy. In the general expressions, the poets fret about the powers of elegy, and in the specific expressions, they fret about their own poetic potency—will they be able to rise to such an occasion?

Generalizing, the poets expand the inadequacy topos to include a whole genre: the elegy is not big enough "to engrosse/ All thy perfections, or weepe all our losse;/Those are too numerous for an elegie" (Carew 87-9). Hyde empathizes with those who won't elegize because they doubt the power of elegy (3-4). Busby's inadequacy topos is both self- and genre-referential, a generic concern both oblique and comparative. "But what doe I? A diminution 'tis/ To speak of him in verse, so short of his,/ Whereof he was the master; All indeed/ Compared with him, pip'd on an Oaten reed" (77-80)—he doesn't want to sound lightweight, pastoral. Cary obliquely refers to Jonson's elegy (13) and as we have seen above, the poets frequently introduce qualifying and defining mentions of elegy.

These poets also specify the impulse for generalized genre-concern by focusing on self-in-genre: they worry about elegizing such a flamboyant elegist. Among the several mentions of Donne's "Anniversary" poems is Mayne's notable opening:

> Who shall presume to mourn thee, Donne, unlesse
> He could his teares in thy expressions dresse,
> And teach his griefe that reverence of thy Hearse,
> To weepe lines, learned, as thy Anniverse,
> A Poëme of that worth, whose every teare
> Deserves the title of a severall yeare. (1-6)

Who shall presume? Eleven other poets presume, not to mention Mayne, who nevertheless cannot muster the poetic power to follow his own (line 2) imitative dictum! His lines are not at all Donne-like, nothing like the

"Anniversary" poems, yet they presume indeed for 80 lines and end with "I could write more." Here is an example of the generic locus of the problem of imitation in critical elegy—not only must the elegists compare their own efforts to Donne's poetry in general, they must compare their *elegies* to his. Porter likewise asks "who shall hereafter write an Elegie?" (24) as Donne did. Twelve poets try in this volume, but not without spinning the genre's inadequacy conventions into some very self-entrapping threads.

It can be argued that all this stretching of the funeral-elegy conventions into critical-elegy conventions really just goes to prove the elasticity of the old genre and the flexibility of the poets writing in it, but I believe these elegists stretch conventions dangerously close to the breaking point of self-obviation. And inadequacy topoi are just part of the danger. Even the relatively disinterested printer (who could after all feel no anxiety of influence, no worries about generic or poetic imitation and fame) participates in the self-obviating tendency of all these elegies:

> . . . [F]or whosoever reades the rest so farre, shall perceive that there is no occasion to use them [the elegies] to that [praising] purpose; yet there they are, as an attestation for their sakes that knew not so much before, to let them see how much honour was attributed to this worthy man, by those that are capable to give it. Farewell.

After reading Donne's poetry, in other words, only fools would need the elegies' praise to form their opinions. Yet there the elegies are, last in the volume, already made unnecessary by the poetry that precedes them; the printer admits it. This is a genre problem expressed in concern for praise and reception, yes, but it also exposes the inherent tension between critical elegy and the poetry it treats: if the poetry is that great, do we really need the elegies' praise and lament? Won't the subject-poetry perform its own consolation, become its own monument?

In fact, the self-memorializing dead poet who is his own monument is another of the main conventions of critical elegy. It, too, is a convention that these elegists stretch towards self-obviation. Milton (1630) on Shakespeare, for example, asks "What needst thou such weak witness of thy name?/ Thou in our wonder and astonishment/ Hast built thyself a livelong monument," using the convention of the self-memorializing poet. Compare Jonson (1623) on Shakespeare: "Thou art a monument without a tomb,/And art alive still, while thy book doth live,/*And we have wits to read, and praise to give*" (emphasis mine). Jonson in the latter line wisely leaves elegists a bit more

power to create literary fame. Not so these foolish elegists, most of whom grant full self-memorializing power to Donne and his poetry.[27] Consider also printer John Marriot's "Hexastichon Bibliopolae," which immediately follows his Preface and immediately precedes Donne's poems. Marriot, perhaps for profit motives, participates in the self-memorializing-poet convention:

> I see in his last preach'd, and printed booke,
> His Picture in a sheete; in Pauls I looke,
> And see his Statue in a sheete of stone,
> And sure his body in the grave hath one:
> Those sheetes present him dead, these if you buy,
> You have him living to Eternity.

The 1633 edition is to be more immortal than even the carved stone in St. Paul's. The printer claims that the poetry is its own immortality and thus implies that the very elegies he includes are unnecessary. This could be just an early example of publishers' insensitivity to poets—after all, Marriot's profits rested on Donne, not on the elegists, whose work he may have considered mere traditional padding for his venture.

But while Marriot's relationship to the self-memorializing-poet convention of critical elegy may have been neutral or even positive, the elegists, whose interests the convention directly opposes, had good reason to struggle with it. Indeed, the elegists on Donne fully ensnare themselves in this self-obviating critical-elegy web. Walton undermines himself after praising Donne: ". . . which can no more be, than Donnes vertue spoke/ By any but himselfe" (80-81). Donne must self-elegize according to Cary (5-6), and according to King he would (pridefully?) have done so, "never to the world beholding bee/ So much, as for an Epitaph for thee" (41-2). King ends his poem exquisitely, though in full use of the convention—

> Commit we then Thee to Thy selfe: Nor blame
> Our drooping loves, which thus to thy owne Fame
> Leave Thee Executour. Since, but thine owne,
> No pen could doe Thee Justice, nor Bayes Crowne[28]
> Thy vast desert; Save that, wee nothing can
> Depute, to be thy Ashes Guardian.
>
> So Jewellers no Art, or Metall trust
> To forme the Diamond, but the Diamonds dust.

But King's elegy is first of twelve, and after that most convincing topos, why read on? The elegists on Donne permit, even encourage the self-memorializing-poet convention to render them (and their sub-genre) superfluous. If the Oedipal goal of critical elegy is, as some believe, to displace the Great Dead One, is this sort of self-obviation really the best way to go about it? To sing continuity or torch-passing and boldly to grab the torch (much as Carew does, Parker argues) would seem to serve better any Bloomian sub-purposes. I do not claim that there is no anxiety of influence at work, but rather that the self-obviating conventions of critical elegy operate in these texts as powerfully or more so than any unconscious psychological forces.

Another powerful and paradoxical convention of critical elegy that similarly affects these poems is to bemoan in a poem the future of poetry. As old as Moschus' lament that all music died with Bion, the spoken or unspoken question is, "what sort of poetry can we possibly write now that our Great Poet is dead?" Gottlieb admits that "an elegist's sense of his own poetic inadequacy or paralysis [is a]. . .familiar [aspect] of the sub-genre 'critical elegy.'"[29] But such familiar elegiac inadequacy and paralysis take on unusual resonance and strength in this collection. The logical suite to all these ensnaring conventions—the self-memorializing poet, the inadequacy, inimitability, and inexpressibility topoi—would be to write no elegy at all. But write they do, despite these conventions' inexorable pull toward silence.

Silence is, paradoxically, the collection's loudest single note. More than just the conventional inexpressibilty topos or modesty/inadequacy topos, silence becomes the self-obviating cry of these elegies. Nearly every one includes either an exhortation to silence or some striking expression of inexpressibility. King is open about it ("Indeed a silence does that tombe befit" {11}), and about his reluctance to elegize ("I doe not like the office" {43}). Carew's "have we no voice, no tune?" (9) and Hyde's musical metaphors (2, 3, 17) play a nice coda to Moschus. Corbett opens and closes by renouncing his own generic project, and his elegy is essentially one long inexpressibility topos. The poet who wishes to elegize Donne, he says, "must be dead first" (18), which sounds absurd but is no more than the logical extension of the conventions he chooses. Conventions so extended express a self-silencing, self-annihilating desire to imitate Donne, even unto Death.

Carew, on the other hand, not sorely afflicted with modesty, will not turn the inadequacy topos fully against himself. His specific catalogue of literary criteria condemns not so much his own inadequacy as his age's. However, he does (disingenuously?) call his lines "faint" (74) and his numbers

"panting" (77), and asks "oh pardon me that break with untuned verse/The reverend silence that attends thy hearse" (71-2). For Valentine, an oxymoron will suffice to express the problem: "language [lyes] speechlesse" (15). Silence, too, is Walton's "safe way" (61). He seeks not elegiac remembrance but forgetting, the emotional equivalent of poetic silence. In a passage of unusual momentum, Walton repeats at closer and closer intervals the imperative "forget" (69, 71, 74, 75, 75); even this strikingly personal passage displays the self-obviating tendency. Mayne, whose muses are "dumb, speechelesse" (16), *writes* that "wee dare not write" (17-18). Porter calls the epitaph a "dumb stone" (3); yet although silent, it is not wordless but inscribed. Porter ends his poem and the collection where King began, with an exhortation to silence: "Poets be silent, let your numbers sleepe" (25). Exhortation to silence becomes the curiously dominant convention of this collection of critical elegies: how eloquently, how loudly they exhort to silence!

When critical elegy secedes from funeral elegy, its sub-generic conventions—inadequacy/inexpressibility, the self-memorializing poet, and especially the exhortations to silence—become paradoxical, self-obviating, almost absurd. The sub-genre tends to be inherently deconstructive: "I'm writing an elegy to say how impossible it is to write elegies now that the great one is dead." The task belies its conventions; the conventions subvert the task.

In fact, the sub-genre's most unique convention, what Murphy calls "mirror criticism" and what I call imitative decorum, actually counters these self-subverting moves while enacting the age's larger conflict between imitation and invention. Furthermore, for all its literary focus, this collection agrees surprisingly little about the specific features of Donne's secular oeuvre. But for now suffice it to note that the 1633 critical elegies reveal a sub-genre stretched to its limits: mainly, as an inherently agonic kind of poetry with deeply self-obviating conventions; and from the very start, as a sub-genre whose rhetorical contexts—occasion, audience, subject, conventions, even purpose—are blurred and multiplied. The elegies on Donne reveal how very much critical elegy's conventions are complicated by its special literary focus.

University of Virginia

Appendix

Elegies' titles	Author	# of lines	apostrophe to Donne?
To the memorie of my ever desired desired friend Dr. Donne	H[enry] K[ing]	58	yes
To the deceased Author, Upon the the Promiscuous printing of his Poems, the Looser sort, with the Religious	Tho[mas] Browne	16	yes
On the Death of Dr Donne	Edw[ard] Hyde	20	yes
On Doctor Donne, By Dr C.B. of O	[Richard Corbett Bishop of Oxford]	18	yes
An Elegie upon the incomparable Dr Donne	Hen[ry] Valentine	54	no
An Elegie upon Dr Donne	Iz[aak] Wa[lton]	82	no
An Elegie upon the death of the Deane of Pauls, Dr Iohn Donne:By Mr. Tho: Carie	[Thomas Carew]	98	yes
An Elegie on Dr. Donne: By Sir Lucius Carie	[Sir Lucius Cary]	90	no
On Donne's Death: By Mr. Mayne of Christ Church in Oxford	[Jasper Mayne]	80	yes
Upon Mr. J. Donne, and his Poems	Arth[ur] Wilson	54	yes
In Memory of Doctor Donne: By Mr R. B.	[Richard Busby]	112	no
Epitaph upon Dr. Donne, by Endy: Porter	[Endymion Porter]	28	no

Notes

[1] See especially G. W. Pigman, *Grief and the English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) and Peter Sacks, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985) on the functions and structures of elegy. All quotations of elegies are from the 1633 edition of Donne's poetry (*Poems With Elegies on the Author's Death* {London: Printed by M. F. for John Marriot, 1633}) unless otherwise noted. The essay will not treat Godolphin's and Chudleigh's elegies

added to the 1635 edition. Thanks to Gordon Braden and Ernest Sullivan for reading an early version of this article.

[2] "The Critical Elegy of Earlier Seventeenth-Century England," *Genre* 5 (1972): 75-105.

[3] Third, these elegies fight a Renaissance war of *imitatio* on the battleground of sub-genre. Fourth, most of what is literary-critical in the collection is generalized, and where there is specificity, the elegists' estimations of Donne's secular poetry differ. This article is chiefly concerned with how the elegists move between genre and sub-genre; I discuss the other two issues more fully in a study in progress.

[4] The emotions engendering these elegies blur as well--sincere, human feelings of loss seem to mix with substantial anxiety arising more from literary than from personal concerns. Do the bells toll for Donne, for poetry, or for the elegists and their own poetry? See on this "sincerity question" James Fitzmaurice's "Carew's Funerary Poetry and the Paradox of Sincerity," *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 25 (1): 127-44.

[5] On the production of the volume, see Ernest W. Sullivan's "*1633* Vndone," forthcoming in *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*. On Browne's elegy, see Robert Thomas Fallon's "Donne's 'Strange Fire' and the 'Elegies on the Author's Death'," *John Donne Journal* 7 (1988), especially pages 199, 203-4, and 208.

[6] Granted that the title is not literal address, and that "to the deceased author" can mean an elided "to the [memory of] the deceased author" or "[dedicated to] the deceased author," the words still echo strangely. Thanks to Ernest Sullivan for this latter and other suggestions.

[7] See Appendix. Note also RB's valediction "Farewell (faire soule)" (97) and Mayne's strange ending, "We cannot hope the like, till thou returne" (80).

[8] Most notably in the introduction to *The English Elegy* (see note 1 above).

[9] Bloom or Bate might attribute such a rewriting of the poet's relationship with Art to the anxiety of influence. But surely Renaissance poets construed their relationship to the past quite differently than did Romantic poets. Metaphors in these elegies frequently represent the relationship between Donne and poetry as sexual: King's "Widowed invention," Browne's poetic phallus, Carew, Mayne, etc. A. J. Murphy (note 2 above) identifies this as a convention of critical elegy too common for more than a footnote, but it is still a fascinating figuration of the relation between poet and Art.

[10] "Claudendu poema exhortationis" (*Poetices libri septem*, Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe Leipzig von Lyon 1561, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1987, III.cxxii, p.168 col 2/B) and ". . . partes hae: Laudes, lacturae demonstratio, Luctus, Consolatio, Exhortatio" (III.cxxii, p.168 col 1/D). Also cited in Antoon Van Velzen, "Two Versions of Funeral Elegy: Henry King's 'The

Exequy" and Thomas Carew's '...Elegie Upon...Donne'," *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 15 (1984), p.46.

[11] "The Remembrance: Model Literature not Elegy." *Parergon: Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 6a (1988): 105-132.

[12] "Elegies Upon the Author: Defining, Defending, and Surviving Donne." *John Donne Journal* 2(2), p. 29.

[13] The imbalance of praise in these elegies also reveals a nice historical contrast in critical interests—criticism in a modern, secular age concerns itself most with the secular side of Donne's work, evidently not the case in 1633. Sullivan (note 5 above) presents evidence that such a conflict led to the censorship of certain of Donne's poems during the assembly of 1633; perhaps Browne's elegy was removed from the 1635 edition because it drew too much attention to the conflict.

[14] pp. 201-5 (note 5 above).

[15] Of 44 entries, the large majority are sermons; only 3 are editions of secular poetry.

[16] p. 29.

[17] "'Diamond's Dust': Carew, King, and the Legacy of Donne," in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, Eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 191-200.

[18] Scaliger's, for example, discussed in Van Velzen 46-8; even Murphy unwittingly reveals (see especially his Appendix) how dependent the critical elegy is on funeral elegy's conventions.

[19] Valentine, Walton, Carew, and Cary.

[20] King, Corbett, Valentine, Walton, Carew, Cary.

[21] Hyde, Carew's famous epitaph, RB, and EP.

[22] Mayne, Porter, King, e. g..

[23] And of critical elegy; West's elegy on Randolph, for example, or Carew's and Mayne's here.

[24] pp. 208-9 (note 5 above).

[25] Had the elegies been placed first in the volume, the last lines of the last elegy in the group would have made an excellent transition to the poetry: "Time hath no Soule, but his exalted verse,/ Which with amazements, we may now reherse."

[26] Corbett's poem, for the best example, is one long inadequacy topos.

[27] Michael Parker excepts Carew ("'Diamond's Dust'," pp. 193-4 and 199-200). I would add that RB's hearth metaphor (93-4) is the collection's other exception.

[28] Compare Carew's tossing the crown of Bayes into the fire. See Michael Parker's intriguing interpretation of the several other verbal echoes between King's and Carew's elegies, pp. 195-8.

[29] p.36 n1 (see note 12 above).